DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 382 564 SP 035 834

AUTHOR Charles, Gregory Stewart; Karr-Kidwell, PJ
TITLE Effective Principals, Effective Schools: Arriving at Site-Based Decision-Making with Successful Principals and Teacher Participation.
PUB DATE [95]
NOTE 38p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Guidelines; Job Satisfaction; Leadership; *Participative Decision Making; Principals; Program Implementation; *School Based Management; School Effectiveness; Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Participation; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews research on principals' and teachers' roles in site-based decision making (SBDM). Research examining teacher participation in SBDM is reviewed, finding that higher quality teaching behaviors and higher student academic attainment resulted from teacher participation. The review focuses on steps in implementing SBDM, means for measuring SBDM, teacher aspirations for participation in site-based management, communication flows in site-based management, the role of principals, and principals' and teachers' job satisfaction. A survey was conducted to determine principals' leadership styles that most positively influenced teacher participation in SBDM. The survey was distributed to 260 teachers in Texas school districts, with an approximately 15 percent response rate. The survey results were used to develop leadership style guidelines about communication that leads to participation, support, job satisfaction, and effective schools. Appendixes contain a copy of the survey form; survey data; a paper based on the survey results, titled "The Efficacious Principal's Guideline for Teachers' Participation in Site-Based Decision-Making"; and six suggestions for principals on communicating with teachers. (Contains 28 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 382 564

EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS, EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

ARRIVING AT SITE-BASED DECISION-MAKING WITH SUCCESSFUL PRINCIPALS AND TEACHER PARTICIPATION

Gregory Stewart Charles
Prosper I.S.D./ Educator
Masters Student, TWU

PJ Karr-Kidwell, Ph.D.
Professor Educational Leadership
Texas Woman's University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P J Karr-Kidwell

G S Charles

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP035834

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Americans have become increasingly skeptical of professionals who claim that expertise entitles them to make decisions free from public interference (Coursen, 1980). This contention holds true for businesses, communities, and schools. If there is to be a community of school leaders in a school, teachers must have the opportunities to take responsibility for the results (Lieberman, 1988). Empowerment gives teachers the opportunity and necessary resources so they can believe, understand, and change their schools (Bredeson, 1989). This paper will cover a related literary review, a survey, a guideline for site-based decision-making, and related conclusions.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Coursen (1980) contends Americans have become increasingly skeptical of professionals who claim that expertise entitles them to make decisions free from public interference. This contention holds true for businesses, communities, and schools. If there is to be a community of school leaders in a school, teachers must have the opportunities to take responsibility for the results (Bredeson, 1989; Lieberman, 1988; Tewel, 1992). Lieberman (1988) added the current structure of leadership in the schools does not permit talented teachers to

work with other adults and students in decisions concerning curriculum and classroom instruction. Empowerment gives teachers the opportunity and necessary resources so they can believe, understand, and change their schools (Bredeson, 1989; Byham, 1992; Flanigan, 1991). Furthermore, Lipham (1981), Meadows (1990) and Liontos (1993) stated groups can usually produce more ideas, stimulate more creative thoughts, develop realistic predictions of decisions, generate more effective teaching techniques and strategies, and generally produce bolder plans than individuals acting alone.

Who Needs Site-Based Decision-Making

Teacher participation in site-based decision-making gives administration access to critical information closest to the source of the many dilemmas in education. It is also more likely to depend on the teachers' knowledge of students' needs (Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd,1988; Smylie, 1992). The more school management systems demonstrated qualities with this kind of participation, the more the teachers showed a higher quality in their teaching behaviors and higher academic attainments with their students (Conway, 1984). The direct benefits Conway (1984) categorized as productive efficiency and included higher worker production, better quality of decisions and products, and the reduction in cost. The indirect benefits

were generally increased levels of worker moral and job satisfaction as manifested in lower absence, tardiness, and reduced conflicts. For some schools, as Tewel (1992) stated, this is the logical, next step in the maturation process. The process continues the school's commitment to quality education for all students by maximizing the opportunity for teachers and school administrators to participate more fully in educational decisions. In Texas, for example, Senate Bill 1 required all 1,056 school districts have site-based management operational by September, 1992 (Hoyle, 1992).

Implementing Site-Based Decision-Making

Prior to beginning the planning process, the central district office needs to provide data to each school about the district's goals. All principals must receive training in the process for school improvement (Flanigan, 1991). If the organization is to be efficient when a myriad of decisions are made, people and programs need to be coordinated, communication conveyed, awarded positions need to be allocated and staff recruited, schedules need to be developed, and resources must be obtained and utilized (Dawson, 1984; Flanigan, 1991; Lieberman, 1988). Subsequently, there must be a resolution for the implementation of site-based decision-making and all parties need to participate in the process. Times when teachers

could meet becomes a major step toward restructuring for shared decision-making (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Bredeson, 1989; Dawson, 1984; Flanigan & Richardson, 1991; Lieberman, 1988; Lipham, 1981). Benson (1989) states though it sounds trite, time is money in teacher empowerment. Time to plan, to interact, to listen, to carry out plans is often translated into budget allocations with assigned cost.

The board's commitment to shift authority and responsibility from the central office to the school without possible veto is a necessity. It is essential that all concerned understand that mistakes are made and patience is imperative (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Coursen, 1980; Hoyle, 1992; Lipham, 1981).

Tewel (1992) proposes the development of a clear mission, clearly stated expectations, measurable results and outcomes, a can-do attitude and an environment that encourages creativity and risk-taking. Since implementing site-based management (SBM) involves numerous factions and takes considerable time, it would be premature to pass final judgment in the early stages (Duke, Showers, & Imber,1980; Keedy & Finch, 1990). It is necessary to understand the factions, the structure of the site-base team and their responsibilities. Appalachia Educational Lab (1988) and Liontos (1993) defined the structure of the site-

base team as students, parents, staff members, Board of Education, and community members. The responsibilities of this team included implementing a problem-solving and decision-making model, monitoring the instructional program, facilitating communication, and engaging staff in activities to assist in creating a positive school climate.

Means for Measuring Site-Based Decision-Making

Byham (1992) expressed confidence that the personnel within schools operate on their own, without teachers being totally dependent on principals. Teachers should feel they have a voice in the decision-making process to express their concerns in receptive climates (Flanigan & Richardson, 1991). All of the site-based decision-making members need to realize that situations are not always black and white, and compromises have to be made. Coursen (1990) stated compromise can be reached in a number of ways: two of the most common are a majority vote and consensus. Consensus is the most effective, because everyone understands and accepts without necessarily agreeing with each decision. Furthermore, when a decision is made, the faculty and administration have to accept it or SBM as a structure will never be accepted (Keedy & Finch, 1990). SBM decisions could include classroom instruction, staff development, discipline, curriculum, and budget development.

exams, grading periods, assessments like the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, and feedback from the faculty are a must (Tewel, 1992).

Teachers : Aspirations for Participation

This movement began as early as the 1970s, indicating that teachers generally desire participation in SBM (Alutto & Belasco, 1973; Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Bredeson, 1989; Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988; Coursen, 1980; Dawson, 1984; Keedy & Finch, 1990; Kunz & Hoy, 1976; Lipham, 1981; Smylie, 1992; Tewel, 1992). Across more years, however, teacher participation has afforded them little influence and thus increased their skepticism; nonetheless, teachers need to be more involved in schools and the district decision-making (Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988). More recently, as the roles changed, their interest grew and momentum for their participation increased; SBM partnerships picked up steam and teachers knew they had more resources and could tackle more problems (Dawson, 1984; Tewel, 1992).

Liontor (1993) stated teachers' desire for participation can be measured in four phases; readiness, experimentation, refinement through trial and error, and institutionalization. The final phase, institutionalization, takes place when the staff and administration assume responsibility for their decisions,

monitor their decision-making process, and inform each other when consensus or agreements have been violated.

Participation in decision-making was usually developed into areas, most importantly classroom instruction, curriculum, staff development, discipline and special events (Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley, & Bauer, 1990; Bredeson, 1989; Dawson, 1984). However, Coursen (1980) and Lipham (1981) cautioned participation in too many decisions would be as dissatisfying as those who did not participate enough in matters of concern.

Teachers' Participation Leads to Support

Researchers, however, have concluded that increased participation in shared decision-making was often associated with increased probability of successful change (Alutto & Belasco, 1973; Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Conway, 1976; Taylor & Others, 1992; Tewel, 1992). Dawson (1984) and Liontos (1993) also affirmed teachers' involvement in the establishment and formulating new programs increased the likelihood of the successful implementation and support. Furthermore, teachers expected support from the principals' end (Bredeson, 1989). Trust and support would be damaged if principals did not accept decisions through the participation of teachers (Meadows, 1990). Lieberman (1988) qualified that such support among principals and teachers was gained as

they shared equally, invested equally, and got equal credit for accomplishments. Liontor (1993) reported that in collectively made decisions, the principal actually gained support and trust as well as giving most of the teachers a heightened sense of commitment to the organization and a fresh awareness of the role of the classroom teacher in the school organization. Thus, trust was so important to the process that if trust was absent, SBM would not work, no matter what type of formal programs or structures had been agreed upon (Bredeson, 1989; Byham, 1992; Coursen, 1988; Liontos, 1993).

Communication and Shared Decision-Making

In shared decision-making, communications flow vertically and horizontally between teachers and principals (Bredeson, 1989). The real trick to good communication is sincere interest in the other person. Communication becomes a two-way process of listening as well speaking and understanding as well as being understood (Coursen, 1980).

The capacity and willingness to listen was perhaps the most important conversational skill that principals needed to develop as teachers became more empowered (Bredeson, 1989). Fortunately, however, there was a learning curve with SBM. As the teachers and administrators gained skill with the process, their communications tended to become more open and

effective, despite the complexities and problems with SBM (Liontos, 1993).

Dawson (1984) states communications break down when the principals adopt new programs which are important to them without listening to the concerns of their teachers. Thus, principals must recognize the importance of keeping the interest alive through shared decision-making with those involved in the project (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988). A principal must confine his or her remarks to the things that are observable and stick to the facts without drawing conclusions about what they mean. This type of supportive communication can help reduce defensiveness, solving the problem rather than controlling the situation and approaching differences of opinions with openness to new perspectives rather than with certainty (Coursen, 1980; Liontos, 1993; Lipham, 1981; Meadows, 1990).

Principals and Professional Zones

The degree to which shared decision-making was allowed and how it was divided, rested in the hands of the principals (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Bredeson, 1989; Flanigan & Richardson,1991). Bredeson (1989) stated that the success of shared decision-making had much to do with the principals' readiness to share power. The fact reaffirms that SDM is a cooperative arrangement designed to add teachers into the

decision-making process rather than turn it over to them entirely (Liontos, 1993). "We just can't make people happy." This quote confirms that there are matters that should be dealt with by the principal (Keedy & Finch, 1990).

Kunz & Hoy (1976) listed three business zones in SBM, namely the organizational maintenance, personal, and professional domain. The professional zone of acceptance of teachers was not related to school size, school wealth, expenditure level, or student-teacher ratio. Neither was the principal's age, tenure, experience, or length of service in the district. These teachers' main concerns of interest were in the professional domain and were influenced by sex, degree level, and type of subject taught (Kunz & Hoy, 1976; Meadows, 1990). Kunz & Hoy (1976) further stated female, post-master's and non-academic teachers had a broader zone of acceptance than did male, pre-master's, and academic teachers respectively (Kunz & Hoy, 1976). Academics were defined as English, language, social studies, mathematics, and science. This suggests that male academic teachers may pose a greater challenge to administrative authority than women academic teachers. Teachers also expressed a higher level of actual and desired participation in areas of curriculum, instruction, staff development, and scheduling parent conferences, but they were

not concerned with the everyday running of the school (Bacharach, Bamberger, Conley, & Bauer, 1990; Bredeson, 1989; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980; Keedy & Finch, 1990; Meadows, 1990; Taylor et al., 1992). Taylor et al. (1992) stated teachers prefer classroom instruction, namely allocation of instructional time, the amount of homework to be assigned, and instructional materials to be used. Meadows (1990) further stated faculty members wanted the principal to make all of the decisions outside the classroom. Some saw the principal's primary responsibilities as safety, security, bus schedules, hiring, teacher evaluation, and weekly communications.

Principals' and Teachers' Job Satisfaction

Teachers' job satisfaction is not simply related to the degree to which they participate, but also to the type of decisions they share (Bredeson, 1989; Conway, 1988; Smylie, 1992; Tewel,1992). Liontos (1993) indicated that more satisfying decisions are made in groups that generated and tested ideas than are made by individuals or poorly functioning groups.

Principals and teachers presently engaging in shared decision-making describe it as both driving and fueling the change process (Liontos, 1993; Tewel, 1992). SBM creates a higher level of professional and personal fulfillment in their jobs,

when the extra time and energy demanded by planning and decision-making are balanced by real authority (Hoyle, 1992). Teachers go to principals less for "backing" and more for advice. With more involvement in shared decision-making, teachers feel they have real input into improving their schools and their work place (Keedy & Finch, 1990). Though a related term "empowerment" is a fairly recent addition to the contempory, educational literature, the concept of shared decision-making allows teachers greater responsibility in their professional work life and job satisfaction (Bredeson, 1989). Lieberman (1988) affirms, if there is to be a community of leaders in the school, teachers must have the opportunities to take responsibilities, more decision-making power, and more accountability for results. Clearly, new organizational forms that enable teachers to work together for a positive development will create job satisfaction (Bredeson, 1989; Liontos, 1993; Smylie,1992; Tewel,1992).

Effective Leaders, Effective Schools

All principals want to be effective leaders in their schools. Those who are willing to share SBM have a great opportunity in becoming effective leaders and even leaders of school reform (Crockenberg & Clark, 1979; Lieberman, 1988). Furthermore, Coursen (1980) and Tewel (1992) state that principals who wish

to lead a group more effectively must have the same training as their SBM teams. Teachers expect effective principals to model effective leadership styles and when teachers invest in their professional growth, they expect the best possible climate to be created. A non-competitive, win-win school climate is created by promoting trust, through modeling, and teaching group skills (Bredeson, 1989; Liontos, 1993).

Dawson (1984) declared effective principals must also have a hands-on approach. They must also must be physically present at important events and repeat publicly the school goals and priorities, and stick to a decision once it is made by the team. Principals must have flexibility and allow failures as well as acknowledging prior failures (Dawson, 1984; Meadows, 1990).

Similar research on effective schools and school improvements emphasized the need for strong leadership (Taylor et al., 1992). The climate for legitimate involvement of teachers in SBM would enhance effective leaders, teachers, and schools (Appalachia Educational Lab, 1988; Conley, Schmidle, & Shedd, 1988; Crockenberg & Clark, 1979; Taylor et al., 1992). The single most important factor in determining the success or failure of a school is the ability of the principal to lead the staff and community in the planning, implementing, and

evaluating improvements in the school's curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs (Lieberman, 1988; Liontos, 1993; Lipham,1981).

PROCEDURES

Another purpose of this paper was to develop a guideline for the efficacious principal in implementing teachers' participation in site-based decision-making within effective schools. The first step in the development of this guideline was to canvass current perceptions regarding participation by teachers in site-based decision-making.

An opening survey was used to enlist teachers' opinions in assessing the leadership styles of principals that most positively influenced their participation in site-based decision-making within their schools (i.e. methods of communications, one-on-one, small groups or committees, faculty as a whole, oral or written communications and other methods teachers might have suggested). This included a Likert-scale survey with the aforementioned topics that the teachers answered indicating leadership styles that most positively influenced their participation in site-based decision-making.

The author submitted the appropriate form for permission to the TWU Human Subjects Review Committee prior to the distribution of the survey. The approval for the survey was

received in July, 1994 (See Appendix A).

The superintendents of Prosper, Gunter, Melissa, and Anna independent school districts approved the anonymous survey before distribution.

The survey and the contributors' release form were distributed to the subjects about August 10, 1994 (See Appendices B & C). The survey was distributed to teachers in the Prosper I.S.D. (N = 55 teachers), Gunter I.S.D. (N = 55 teachers), Melissa I.S.D. (N = 25 teachers), and Anna I.S.D. (N = 125 teachers). All four school districts are in small, rural communities. The contributors returned the surveys in postage-paid envelopes addressed to the author. Of the 260 educators from four districts, approximately 15% returned the surveys and an analysis was provided (See Appendix D).

Based on the results of the survey and literature review, the development for the guidelines focused on the leadership styles of principals who successfully influenced teachers' participation in site-based decision-making. Such styles included communications that lead to participation, support, job satisfaction, and effective schools. For example, vital areas by Conway (1976) and Coursen (1980) for implementing, measuring, and gaining support for site-based decision-making, along with creating effective schools for children, were

also included. The importance of quality participation, as viewed by Alutto and Belasco (1976), Kunz and Hoy (1976), and the author's 1994 survey results were included in the guidelines (See Appendix E).

In the guidelines, there was another section on tips to help principals encourage participation in shared decision-making in their schools (See Appendix F). Because teachers are an important front-line source of information for principals, these suggestions were presented in a simple but practical format that principals would find useful in their pilgrimages in becoming effective principals in effective schools (See Appendix F).

CONCLUSIONS

In Texas, Senate Bill 1 required that all 1,056 school districts have site-based management (SBM) operational by September, 1992. In the authors' opinion, legislation might have required site-based management be in operation by September, 1992, but until principals at diverse districts are willing to relinquish their power and empower teachers, SBM will never happen or reach its potential, becoming just another "buzz word" in educational jargon.

Given transition periods, SBM will help end this increasing skepticism of professionals in education. SBM can create an organization that belongs to the communities who choose to

involve themselves in the decision-making process.

Any principal's task in SBM will be to create an organization that works effectively, in an environment that encourages participation, creativity, and risk-taking. One of the problems to resolve will be the lack of communication between teachers and principals in their new roles in site-based management. If this area is problematic, it will only be corrected through collaboration among teachers, principals, and their colleagues.

It is the authors' belief that the information canvassed through the survey and the information gathered in the review of related literature for the development of this guideline will assist the efficacious principal. This assistance will help principals take positive action for a consistent voice in the decision-making process, especially for those teachers who are in the front lines and are the most knowledgeable about the needs and achievements of their students and school districts.

REFERENCES

Alutto, J. A. , & Belasco, J. A. (1973). Patterns of teacher participation in school system decision making. Educational Administration Quarterly,9, 27-47.

Association, VA. (1988). Participatory decisionmaking: Working in Virginia elementary school (Report No. PS-017-873). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 157)

Bacharach, S. B. , Bamberger, P. , Conley, S. C. , & Bauer, S. (1990).The dimensionality of decision participation in educational organizations: The value of a multi-domain evaluation approach. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26(2),126-167.

Bowman, G. A. (1992). Reanalysis of state-initiated top-down versus bottom-up educational reform (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California,1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(9) , 3133A-3134A.

Bredeson, P. V. (1989). Redefining leadership and the roles of school principal: Responses to changes in the professional work life of teachers (Report No. EA-020-805). San Francisco, CA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 782)

Byham, W. C. (1992). Zapp in education . New York: Ballantine.

Ballantine. Conway, J.A. (1976). Test of linearity between teacher's participation in decision making and their perceptions of their schools as organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 21, 130-139.

Conway, J.A. (1984). The myth, mystery, and mastery of participation in decision making in education. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20, 11-40.

Conley, S. C. , Schmidle, T. , & Shedd, J. B. (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school system. The College Record, 90(2), 259-280.

Coursen, D. (1980). Communications in the open organization (Report No. EA-012-503). Burlingame, CA: Paper presented by Foundation for Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 451)

Crockenberg, V. , & Clark, W. W. , (1979). Teacher participation in school decision-making: The San Jose teacher involvement project. Phi Delta Kappen , 61 (2) , 115-118.

Dawson, J. A., (1984). The principal's role in facilitating teacher participation: Mediating the influence of school context (Report No. EA-016-774). New Orleans, LA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 346)

Drolet, B. A. (1993). The power beneath the surface: Identifying behavioral norms in the elementary schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53 (8), 2617.

Duke, D. L. ,Showers, B. K. , & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The cost and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16(1) , 93-106.

Flanigan, J. L. , & Richardson, M. D. (1991). Shared decision making and the transition of the principalship (Report No. EA-023-457). Fargo, ND: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 088)

Hoyle, J. R. (1992). Ten commandments for successful site-based management. National Association of Secondary Principal Bulletin, 76, 81-87.

James, T. K. (1992). The factors affecting the implementation of site-based management and the role of the principal (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52(6), 1716A.

Keedy, J.L., & Finch, A. M. (1990). Implementing a shared decision-making structure: A case study (Report No. EA-022-698). Atlanta, GA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 116)

Kunz, D. W. , & Hoy, W. K. (1976). Leadership style of principals and the professional zone of acceptance of teachers. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 49-64.

Lieberman, A. (1988). Teacher and principals: Turf, tension, and new task. Phi Delta Kappan, 45, 648-653.

Liontos, L. B. (1993). Shared decision-making (Report No. EA-025-454). Eugene, OR: Paper presented by Oregon School Study Council. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 363 969)

Lipham, J. M. (1981). Effective principals, effective schools (Report No. EA-013-836). Reston, VA: Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 131)

Meadows, B. J. (1990). The rewards and risks of shared leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 47, 545-548.

Russell, J. J. , Cooper, B. S. , & Greenblatt, R. B. (1992). How do you measure shared decision making? Educational Leadership, 50, 39-40.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making: Assessing willingness to participate. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14, 53-67.

Taylor, D. L. , Thompson, B., & Bogotch, I. E. (1992). A q-technique study with school as the analytic unit (Report No. TM-018-244). San Francisco, CA: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 344 914)

Tewel, K. J. (1992). Preparing for restructuring: A step-by-step approach to building support. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 76, 103-113.

Warner, F. U. (1993). An action science study of educators engaged in learning model II in a participatively managed school (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland College Park,. Dissertation Abstracts International, 53 (7), 2232.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

DENTON/DALLAS/HOUSTON

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

OFFICE OF
RESEARCH AND
GRANTS ADMINISTRATION
P.O. Box 22939
Denton, TX 76204-0939
Phone: 817/898-3375

May 24, 1994

Gregory S. Charles
P.O. Box 664
Prosper, TX 75078

Dear Gregory S. Charles: Social Security #: 465-98-1987

Your study entitled "A Study of Site-Based Decision-Making and Recommendations for Effective Principals and Effective Schools" has been reviewed by a committee of the Human Subjects Review Committee and appears to meet our requirements in regard to protection of individuals' rights.

Be reminded that both the University and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) regulations typically require that signatures indicating informed consent be obtained from all human subjects in your study. These are to be filed with the Human Subjects Review Committee. Any exception to this requirement is noted below. Furthermore, according to HHS regulations, another review by the Committee is required if your project changes.

Special provisions pertaining to your study are noted below:

_X_ The filing of signatures of subjects with the Human Subjects Review Committee is not required.

_X_ Your study is exempt from further TWU Human Subjects Review.

___ No special provisions apply.

Sincerely,

Chairman
Human Subjects Review Committee

cc: Graduate School
Dr. P. J. Karr-Kidwell, Educational Leadership
Dr. Howard Stone, Educational Leadership

Appendix B

Site-Based Decision-Making Survey

Site-based decision-making methods are a daily part of our lives as professional educators. The following survey is designed to find out your professional opinions and comments on this contemporary subject. The information you give will be used anonymously in my graduate professional paper at Texas Woman's University.

Please respond to the following questions and statements and return the survey in the self-addressed envelope provided. **Thank you** for your contribution in this study.

General Information

____- Prosper I.S.D. ____- Gunter I.S.D. ____- Melissa I.S.D. ____- Anna I.S.D.

Grade level taught (**Most** of the day) _____

I have had professional training in Site-Based Decision-Making. ____ yes ____ no
If yes, when and where did you receive training? _____

_____

_____

For the following statements, circle the number that **BEST** corresponds to your response from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Principals, as effective facilitators, have the basic sense of communication, listening as well as speaking, understanding as well as being understood.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Principals, as effective facilitators, should communicate with the staff in small groups (committees).	1	2	3	4	5
3. Principals, as effective facilitators, should communicate with the staff in a one-on-one situation.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Principals, as effective facilitators, encourage professional communications of expression without repercussions.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Principals, as effective facilitators, encourage teachers to contribute to the development of a plan to meet the school's goals.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Principals, as effective facilitators, must serve as a member of a committee, not always as the leader.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Principals, as effective facilitators, must have the same skills, knowledge, and training as the staff in decision-making.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8. Principals, as effective facilitators, encourage freedom of choice for teachers in zones of interest for committee service (e.g. Curriculum, Inservice training, Budget, Personnel selection, Student discipline, and Scheduling).	1	2	3	4	5
9. Principals, as effective facilitators, encourage community members to serve on Site-Based Decision-Making committees.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Principals, as effective facilitators, are trustworthy, discussing personnel decisions with personnel committee only.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Principals, as effective facilitators, are expected to be well informed about concerns, issues, and programs within the school.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Principals, as effective facilitators, will create adequate opportunities to interact and plan during school time.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Principals, as effective facilitators, should be highly visible around the school and demonstrate a professional appearance (well dressed, and fashionable for school events).	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions are directed to the teachers' feelings when given an opportunity to participate in Site-Based Decision-Making (SBDM).

14. I feel the desire to participate in SBDM and commit the time needed.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Teacher evolvement in S.B.D.M. leads to greater support for the effective principal.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I feel greater job satisfaction because of my role in SBDM.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I feel SBDM will bring about change, namely effective principals and effective schools.	1	2	3	4	5

The preceding questions are open-ended in order to acquire your professional insights and recommendations for **TIPS**. _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

" **Return** of this completed questionnaire constitutes your informed consent to participate in this research study."

Again **Thanks** for your contribution in this research project!

Greg Charles, Educator, Prosper I.S.D.

Appendix C

Dear Contributor:

Thank you for considering the possibility of participating in a research project concerning site-based decision-making. The purpose of the research is to develop guidelines for the implementation by principals for teachers' participation in site-based decision-making. In the study, I will ask you to contribute by filling out the survey on effective principals.

I foresee the only potential risk to a contributor might be disclosure. However, I will strive to preserve the privacy of each contributor by administering the survey anonymously. No names will be used with the results, only schools and grade level taught. I do expect that the information that you provide will benefit principals seeking to be effective leaders in effective schools.

When the final report is complete, no names will be used to protect the confidentiality of the information you have provided. The records from the study will be maintained at my home for five years from the end of the study with access controlled by myself.

I do not expect there to be any risk to you as a result of this study. However, you should be informed that no medical services or compensation is provided to the subjects by the university as a result from participation in research. If you have any questions about the research, or if you need to contact someone regarding a research-related injury, please contact Greg Charles at Prosper I.S.D. 214-346-2455 or my home 214-347-2844.

If you have any questions about the way this research has been conducted, contact the Texas Woman's University Office of Research and Grants Administration, P.O. Box 22939 Denton, Tx. 76204-0939 or 817-898-3375.

Any contributor who would like the results of this survey may send a self addressed stamped envelop along with their survey.

Appendix D

Survey Analysis

Percentage Totals of All Schools

Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1	55.88	44.12	0	0	0
2	41.18	52.94	2.94	2.94	0
3	47.06	47.06	2.94	2.94	0
4	52.94	29.41	5.88	11.77	0
5	58.82	41.18	0	0	0
6	58.82	26.47	14.71	0	0
7	55.88	29.41	2.94	11.77	0
8	38.24	50.00	8.82	2.94	0
9	38.24	47.06	11.76	2.94	0
10	52.94	35.29	8.82	2.94	0
11	76.47	23.53	0	0	0
12	61.76	35.29	2.94	0	0
13	79.41	17.65	2.94	0	0
14	38.24	44.12	14.71	2.94	0
15	41.18	38.24	20.59	0	0
16	20.59	23.53	47.06	5.88	2.94
17	32.35	38.24	26.47	2.94	0

APPENDIX E

THE EFFICACIOUS PRINCIPAL'S GUIDELINE FOR TEACHERS' PARTICIPATION IN SITE-BASED DECISION-MAKING

According to Kunz & Hoy (1976) there are three zones of acceptance by teachers: organizational, personal, and professional, with the professional being the most problematic for the efficacious leadership styles of principals. Kunz & Hoy (1976) identify two leadership styles perceived by teachers as being essential, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the establishment of well defined patterns of organization, avenues of communication, and methods of procedures. Consideration refers to perceptions of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between leader and members of the staff. Alutto and Belasco (1973) and Kunz and Hoy (1976) agreed about two things that influenced how teachers perceived a principal's effectiveness in one or both of these leadership styles: they were sex and age of the teachers. In the author's 1994 survey, initiating communication and consideration for mutual trust were perceived to be influential regarding teachers' perception of effective principals. The survey results for "initiating

communication" indicated 52.94 strongly agreed, 29.41 agreed, 5.88 had no opinion, and 11.77 disagreed. The results for "consideration for mutual trust" revealed 52.94 strongly agreed, 35.29 agreed, 8.2 had no opinion, 2.94 disagreed, and no teachers strongly disagreed.

* Principals perceived by teachers as strong on initiating structure and consideration will have teachers with a wider professional zone of acceptance than principals perceived as strong on consideration but weak on initiating structure.

* Principals perceived by teachers as strong on consideration and weak on initiating structure will have teachers with a wider professional zone of acceptance than principals perceived as strong on initiating structure and weak on consideration.

* Principals perceived by teachers as strong on initiating structure and weak on consideration will have teacher with a wider professional zone of acceptance than principals who are weak in both initiating structure and consideration.

Alutto and Belasco (1973) suggested participation in SBDM ranged from the mere presentation of an opinion, where the final authority rested elsewhere, to membership in the group which exercised final control over an issue. Alutto and Belasco (1973) gave examples of suggested participation when they declared younger males experienced decisional deprivation, while middle-aged females experienced decisional equilibrium, and older females experienced decisional saturation. The author's 1994 survey, points out 58.82 strongly agreed, 41.18 agreed, and no teachers had no opinion or disagreed that effective principals encourage teachers to contribute to the development for meeting school goals.

* Principals who first recognize the existence of different patterns of decisional participation and do not strong-arm participation among teachers possess one or both leadership styles deemed essential by teachers.

* Principals who understand older females' experience decisional saturation, should consider using them as an outside resource for the decision-making committee to tap their vast experiences and allow them their desired participation level in SBDM.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

* Principals initiating structure in committee development should consider using middle-aged females as chairpersons because of their decisional equilibrium and consider using younger males as committee information investigators because of their excessive energy due to decisional deprivation.

Conway (1976) indicated participation in degree, content, and scope were positively associated with productivity and reduced resistance to change significantly in SBDM. Degree was defined as "full participation as equals" in the choice-process by teachers. Content was divided into three basic areas, namely organizational, personal, and professional. Scope was defined as "desired sequence of involvement" by teachers. In the author's 1994 survey, degree and content were perceived to be influential regarding teachers' perception of effective principals. The survey results for "degree" indicated 58.82 strongly agreed, 26.47 agreed, 14.71 had no opinion, and no teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed. The results for "content" revealed 38.24 strongly agreed, 50.00 agreed, 8.82 had no opinion, 2.94 disagreed and no teachers strongly disagreed.

* Principals who create the "opportunity to lead" committees and serve as committee members "without the threat of veto" acknowledge teachers as equals in the decision-making process. They possessed the leadership styles deemed essential by teachers and allowed them to receive a wider professional zone of acceptance.

* Principals who understand organization, personal, and professional zones and the influence they have on "participant satisfaction", understand the importance of leadership styles deemed essential by teachers.

* Principals who initiate teacher involvement in the decision-making process during the "formative stages" and continue through the "final stages" of the decision-making will receive a wider professional zone of acceptance from teachers particularly for their commitment to SBDM.

According to Coursen (1980) and the author's 1994 survey, good communication has always been an important part of effective school leadership style. The author's survey, points out 55.88 strongly agreed, 44.12 agreed, and no teachers had no opinion or disagreed that effective principals have a basic sense of communication and applied it. SBM groups should have well-defined ground rules under which they operate. Good SBM communication begins by defining a problem, analyzing the problem, and deciding on a solution for the problem.

* Principals who direct the focus on evidence rather than opinions, regard participants as equals sharing a common goal, and seek outside resource help as needed will receive a wider zone of acceptance from the teachers.

* Principals who utilize the strengths and abilities of each group member, encourage creativity, and respect the opinions of the minority will receive a wider zone of acceptance from the teachers.

* Principals who do not allow one or two individuals to control the group with their personal agendas, guarantee participation will be shared and communication channels will be kept open.

Hoyle (1992) declared principals who "dress for success" are perceived by teachers as having a greater impact in staff planning, implementing, and evaluating improvement in SBDM. The author's 1994 survey results for "professional appearance" indicated 79.41 strongly agreed, 17.65 agreed, 2.94 had no opinion, and no teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed.

* Principals who grasp the importance of professional appearance will receive a wider zone of professional acceptance from the teachers.

There is a single most important factor in determining the success or failure of a school. It is the ability of the principal to lead the staff in the planning, implementing, and evaluating improvements, in the school's curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs (Lieberman, 1988; Liontos, 1993; Lipham, 1981).

* Principals need to recognize that their ability to lead the staff, is the single most important factor in determining the "success or failure" of a school.

All principals want to be effective leaders in their schools. Those who are willing to share SBM have a great opportunity in becoming effective leaders and even leaders of school reform. Hopefully this guideline will help you in your pilgrimage to becoming an efficacious principal in an effective school.

A last thought.....

* Effective schools use SBM to train future administrators within the district (Bredeson, 1989; Liontos, 1993).

APPENDIX F

TEACHERS' VOICES: SHARING "SIX TIPS" FOR PRINCIPALS

Teacher participation in SBDM centers around communication. Remember the three keys for successful communication? Listening allows others to speak. Speaking the facts allows for better understanding. Understanding leads to greater support.

1. Communication with teachers in small groups or one-on-one situations are the most effective.

2. Communication is vital and keeps you well informed about teacher's concerns, issues, and programs within the school.

3. Communication takes time. Creating adequate opportunities to interact and plan during school time, is time well spent.

4. Proper communication leads to better decision-making. Decision-makers need the same skills, knowledge, and training.

5. Communication is improved as everyone has the opportunity to lead committees and serve as committee members.

6. Communication is choice. Encouraging freedom of choice for teachers in "zones of interest" in committee service stimulates curriculum, classroom instruction, and achievement.

Author's (1994) survey and results: Prosper I.S.D., Gunter I.S.D., Melissa I.S.D., and Anna I.S.D.